UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

JOSEPH J. DIBENEDETTO, Plaintiff,

vs.

NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION, Defendant. CIVIL ACTION NO.: 04-10570-RCL

NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION'S MOTION IN LIMINE TO PRECLUDE THE PLAINTIFF FROM OFFERING ANY EVIDENCE ON THE ISSUE OF CAUSATION

The defendant National Railroad Passenger Corporation ("AMTRAK") moves in limine to exclude any evidence of the cause of the plaintiff's injuries at the trial of this matter on the grounds that: (1) expert testimony is necessary to prove causation; (2) no expert witnesses were identified or disclosed in a timely fashion, or in compliance with Fed. R. Civ. P. 26's disclosure requirements; and (3) any expected expert opinions do not meet the requirements of Fed. R. Evid. 702 and the standards established by the Supreme Court in <u>Daubert v. Merrill-Dow</u>

<u>Pharmaceuticals, Inc.</u>, 509 U.S. 579 (1993). As further grounds, the defendant states as follows:

In his *Complaint*, the plaintiff alleged that he suffered carpal tunnel syndrome as a result of repetitive trauma associated with his work activities while employed by AMTRAK. A copy of the plaintiff's *Complaint* is attached as Exhibit "A." The plaintiff claims that the everyday activities of his job (primarily the use of a hammer) exposed him to "occupational risk factors for carpal tunnel syndrome, including but not limited to repetition, force, vibration and awkward wrist posture" and resistive motions of the hand and wrist which have led to his injuries. Exh. A at ¶8. He also claims that his injuries were caused by the defendant's "failure to provide a timely and adequate ergonomic program designed to prevent occupational carpal tunnel syndrome." Id.

at ¶9(b).

In cases such as this, involving complex medical and liability issues, where the causal connection is not obvious to a layman, "such as a broken leg from being struck by an automobile," expert testimony is required. Schmaltz v. Norfolk & Western Ry., 896 F. Supp. 180 (N.D.III. 1995) quoting Moody v. Maine Central Railroad Co., 823 F. 2d 693, 695 (1st Cir. 1987); see also Claar v. Burlington Northern Railroad Co., 29 F.3d 499, 503 (9th Cir. 1994) ("where special expertise is necessary to draw a causal inference, expert testimony is necessary."); 4 F. Harper, F. James, O. Gray, The Law of Torts, 269. Expert testimony is also necessary to prove that the defendant's ergonomic program was inadequate, that the plaintiff's tools were defective and that these deficiencies somehow caused the plaintiff's arthritis.

In order to recover in this case, the plaintiff must present some evidence that his alleged arthritis was caused by the defendant's negligence. For the reasons advanced in the defendant's *Motion In Limine To Preclude The Testimony Of The Plaintiff's "Expert" Witnesses*, which is referred to and specifically incorporated herein by this reference, the plaintiff does not have an expert to testify that his injuries were caused by the defendant's negligence or that the tools, workplace activities or "ergonomic" program caused his injuries. As expert testimony is required on the issue of causation, any lay witness called to testify in this case, including the plaintiff, must be precluded from testifying about the cause of the plaintiff's injuries or about any other issues which would normally require expert testimony (such as the condition of the plaintiff's tools and the defendant's "ergonomic" program).

To date, the plaintiff has failed to identify any expert witness to testify that the plaintiff's injuries were caused by his employment with AMTRAK or AMTRAK's negligence. The

plaintiff has failed to identify his treating physician, Dr. Jesse Jupiter ("Dr. Jupiter"), as an expert witness and has failed to provide any of the disclosures required by Rule 26 with any opinion testimony which he expects to elicit from Dr. Jupiter. He has done the same with respect to his proposed liability expert, Robert Andres, M.D. As the deadline to identify experts and conduct expert discovery has long since passed, the plaintiff is now precluded from offering any witness to testify about the cause of the plaintiff's injuries. The plaintiff has failed to demonstrate that any of his alleged injuries were caused by his employment with AMTRAK and therefore, any evidence regarding the cause of his alleged injuries should be excluded.

In addition, even if the plaintiff's experts had been timely and adequately disclosed, their opinions are never the less inadmissible because they fail to meet the requirements of Fed. R. Evid. 702 and Daubert v. Merrill-Dow Pharmaceuticals, Inc., 509 U.S. 579 (1993). More specifically, any expert opinion that the plaintiff's arthritis was caused by his work-related activities is not reliable and therefore inadmissible. It is the defendants' position that any opinion that so-called "repetitive stress" injuries can be caused by any occupational task is inadmissible since this relationship is neither generally accepted in the relevant medical community nor is any opinion on this issue based on reliable scientific methodology. Furthermore, the plaintiff's expert's opinions are based neither on "sufficient facts or data" nor principles and methods which have been applied reliably to this case. Courts have consistently excluded experts in repetitive stress cases where their opinions are not based on sufficient facts or data due to the expert's failure to adequately investigate the plaintiff's actual work history, personal risk factors and potential other causes. For a more detailed discussion on this issue, AMTRAK refers to and specifically incorporates herein by this reference, its Motion In Limine To Preclude The

Testimony Of The Plaintiff's Expert Witnesses, which was also filed today.

WHEREFORE, for the above entitled reasons, because the plaintiff has no reasonable likelihood of proving causation at trial, any evidence of causation should be excluded.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I served a copy of the foregoing pleading on all parties by hand mail delivering same, to all counsel of record.

Signed under the pains and penalties of perjury.

DATED: December 30, 2005

DATED

Michael B. Flynn, BBO #559023

National Railroad Passenger Corporation,

John E. Young, BBO #654093 FIYNN & ASSOCIATES, P.C.

400 Crown Colony Drive

Respectfully submitted,

By its attorneys,

Suite 200

Quincy, MA 02169

(617) 773-5500

(617) 773-5510 (facsimile)

EXHIBIT A

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS Boston Division

JOSEPH J. DIBENEDETTO 27 Western Avenue Wakefield, MA 01880 04 10570 RCI

MAGISTRATE JUDGE DEAT

Plaintiff

vs.

NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION 253 Summer Street Boston, MA 02210

Defendant

JURY TRIAL DEMAN

LOCAL RULE 4.1

TOW

WAIVER FORM.

BY DPTY CLK

CIVIL ACTION

NO.

- 1. The Plaintiff, Joseph DiBenedetto, is a competent adult individual residing at 27 Western Avenue, Wakefield, Massachusetts O1880.
- 2. The Defendant, National Railroad Passenger Corporation is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the District of Columbia, doing business at and whose address for service of process is 253 Summer Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02210.
- 3. This suit is brought pursuant to an Act of Congress known as the Federal Employers' Liability Act (F.E.L.A.), 45 U.S.C. §§51-60; the Federal Safety Appliance Acts, 45 U.S.C.§§1-16; and the Boiler Inspection Acts, 45 U.S.C.§§22-34.
- 4. At all times material hereto, the Defendant, National Railroad Passenger Corporation, was engaged in Interstate commerce as a common carrier by railroad operating a line and system of railroads in the State of Massachusetts and other states of the United States.

- 5. At the time and place hereinafter mentioned, the acts of omission and commission causing injuries to the Plaintiff was done by the Defendant, its agents, servants, workmen and/or employees acting in the course and scope of their employment with and under the direct and exclusive control of the Defendant.
- 6. At the time and place hereinafter mentioned, the Plaintiff was employed by Defendant railroad and was acting in the scope of his employment by Defendant and was engaged in the furtherance of interstate commerce within the meaning of the F.E.L.A.
- 7. All the property, equipment and operations involved in this occurrence hereinafter referred to were owned and/or under the direct and exclusive control of the Defendant, its agents, servants, workmen and/or employees.
- 8. The Plaintiff has been employed by the Defendant from July 14, 1976 through and including the present as a carman, and, while working within the scope of his employment in and around Boston, Massachusetts, was exposed to occupational risk factors for carpal tunnel syndrome, including but not limited to repetition, force, vibration and awkward wrist posture.
- 9. Plaintiff's injuries were caused in whole or in part by the negligence, carelessness and recklessness of the Defendant and its agents, servants, workmen and/or employees, acting within the scope of their employment, which negligence consisted of the following:
 - a) failure to provide the plaintiff with a safe place to work as required by the Federal Employers' Liability Act, 45 U.S.C. §§51-60; the Federal Safety Appliance 45 U.S.C. §§1-16; and the Boiler Inspection Acts, 45 U.S.C. §§22-34.

- failure to provide a timely and adequate ergonomic program designed
 to prevent occupational carpal tunnel syndrome;
- c) failure to comply with safety and operating rules and regulations of the Defendant;
- d) forcing the Plaintiff to work under hurried and/or awkward conditions;
- e) negligence of the Defendant's agents, servants, workmen and/or employees; and
- f) negligence at law; and
- g) otherwise failing to exercise due and adequate care under the circumstances including, but not limited to, a lack of adequate manpower.
- 10. As a direct result of the Defendant's negligence, through its agents, servants, workmen and/or employees, the Plaintiff suffered occupational carpal tunnel syndrome.
- 11. The Plaintiff was diagnosed with occupational carpal tunnel syndrome which required surgery.
- 12. As a direct result of the Defendant's negligence, through its agents, servants, workmen and/or employees, the Plaintiff has been unable to attend to his usual duties and occupations, all of which caused substantial financial loss and all of which may and probably will continue in the future.
- 13. As a direct result of the Defendant's negligence, through its agents, servants, workmen and/or employees, the Plaintiff has been and may continue to be required to receive and undergo medical treatment and medical care, including surgery, and has incurred

reasonable and necessary medical expenses, all of which may and probably will continue in the future.

- As a direct result of the Defendant's negligence, through its agents, servants, 14. workmen and/or employees, the Plaintiff has sustained pain, suffering, inconvenience, stress and a loss of enjoyment of life and may continue to suffer same for an indefinite period of time in the future.
- The Defendant has a duty to provide a reasonably safe place to work. It had 15. a non-delegable duty to insure that the Plaintiff had adequate qualified assistance to perform the functions of his work without unnecessary risk of injury to himself. The Defendant has a duty to provide a sufficient number of employees to perform assigned work, and its failure to provide adequate assistance can be a breach of its duty to provide a safe place for the Plaintiff to work, and will entitle the Plaintiff to a recovery against the Defendant if any such failure was a cause, in whole or in part, of the injuries claimed by the Plaintiff.

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff demands judgment against the Defendants in an amount in excess of ONE HUNDRED FIFTY THOUSAND DOKLARS, \$150,000.00).

Dated: 3/19/04

THOMASYJ. JOYGE, NI, ESQUIRE The Public Ledger Building - Suite 1000

150 S. Independence Mall West

Philadelphia, PA 19106

HANNON & IOYCE

(888) 222-3352

Attorney for Plaintiff

LAWSON & WEITZEN, LLP

Dated:

MICHAEL I. MCDEVITT, BBO #564720

88 Black Falcon Avenue, Suite 345

Boston, MA 02210

(617) 439-4990

Local Counsel for Plaintiff

SJS 44 (Rev. 3/99)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS-44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS Joseph J. D. 27 Western A Wakefield, I (b) County of Residence of (EX	Avenue MA 01880	iddlesex CASES)			<u></u>	ailroad Street 02210 ccc of First Lic (IN U.S. PL. D CONDEMNA INVOLVED	sted	S ONLY)			
(c) HANNON & JOYCE The Public Ledger Bldg, 150 S. Independence M Philadelphia, PA 19106 (215) 446-4460 Autorney for Plaintiff	all West Suite 345	on Avenue 02210 990			Attorneys (If Kno				-		
II. BASIS OF JURISD	ICTION (Place an "X"	in One Box Only)			ZENSHIP OF Pl versity Cases Only)	RINCIPAL	, PARTIES	Place an "X" in On and One Box fo			
U.S. Government	nent 23 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)			Citizen	of This State						
☐ 2 U.S. Government ☐ 4 Diversity Defendant (Indicate Citi zenship of Parties in Item III)				Citizen of Another State 2 2 Incorporated and Principal Place 5 5 of Business in Another State Citizen or Subject of a 2 3 3 Foreign Nation 6 6							
TY NATION OF CITY	Γ (Place an "X" in C	ne Roy Only)		Fore	gn Country						
IV. NATURE OF SUI		RTS	1	PORFI	ITURE/PENALTY	BANK	RUPTCY	OTHER S	TATUT	ES	
110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 130 Miller Act 140 Negatiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of 144smethcare Act 152 Recovery of Defauked Student Loans (Excl. Voteans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation 220 Force losure 230 Rent Lesse & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	Slandor 330 Federal Employers' Limbility 340 Marine 345 Marine Product	PRISONER PETTT S10 M otions to Vac Sentence Habeas Corpus: 530 Genorat 533 De sih Penahy 540 Mandamus & 0 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condision	RTY E IONS	620 625 640 640 650 660 660 710 720 730	Agriculture Other Food & Drug Prog Related Scizure of Propedy 2t USC Liquor Laws R.R. & Truck Airline Regs. Occupational Safety/Health Other LABOR Fair Labor Standards Act Lisbor/Mgmt. Relations Labor/Mgmt. Reporting & Disclosure Act Rellway Labor Act Other Labor Läigston tempt. Ret. Inc. Security Act	820 Copyri 830 Patent 840 Traden 840 Traden 861 H1A (I 862 Black 863 DIW C 864 SSID 865 RSI (4 FEDERAL 870 Texas (or Defe 871 IRS	SECURITY 3 95ff) The W (405 (g)) The XY1 05(g)) TAXSUITS U.S. Plaintiff undent)	810 Selective 850 Securities Exchange 875 Customet 12 USC 891 Agricu'tu 892 Economi 893 Environtm 894 Enorgy / 895 Freedom Informat 900 App Determines in Justice 950 Constitut 890 Other Ste	d Banking cc/ICC Re ion r Influence Drganizati Service s/Commod C balleng 3410 rsl Acts a Stabilization of ion Act cal o fluent Acts	tios/cic. cd and ons divices/ cc stion Act tiors Act f Fee ss to f	
V. ORIGIN M Original □ 2 1	Removed from 3	Remanded from Appellate Court		Reope	ated or 5 (specified	ferred from er district fy)	□ 6 Multidiste Litigation	rict □ 7 N	District udge from Augistrat udgment	m te	
VI. CAUSE OF ACT	ION (Cite the U.S. Civil Su Do not cite jurisdictio	tute under which you are nal statutes unless diversi	filing and ly.)	d write	onef statement of cause.						
Federal Empl	oyers Liabilit	y Act 45 U.	s.c.	. §§	51 -60 et se	· p					
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	CHECK IF THE UNDER F.R.C	S IS A CLASS ACTI	ON	DEN	MANDS 150,00	, , ,	IECK YES only RY DEMAND	_	complai □ No	nt:	
VIII. RELATED CAS		#UDG E			7	DOCKE	T NUMBER				
FOR OPPICE USE ONLY		SIGNATURE OF	TORN	E XCO	HECORP						
RECEIPT #	AMOUN	APPLYING IFP	-	<i>y</i>	JUDGE		MAG, JU	DGE			

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

		r Corporation
Cate	gory in whi	ich the case belongs based upon the numbered nature of suit code listed on the civil cover sheet. (See
local	rule 40,1(a)	(i)(1)).
	l.	160, 410, 470, R.23, REGARDLESS OF NATURE OF SUIT.
	II.	195, 368, 400, 440, 441-444, 540, 550, 555, 625, 710, 720, 730, *Also complete AO 120 or AO 121 for patent, trademark or copyright cases
X	111,	110, 120, 130, 140, 151, 190, 210, 230, 240, 245, 290, 310, 315, 320, 330, 340, 345, 350, 355, 360, 362, 365, 370, 371, 380, 385, 450, 891.
	IV.	220, 422, 423, 430, 460, 510, 530, 610, 620, 630, 640, 650, 660, 690, 810, 861-865, 870, 871, 875, 900.
	V.	150, 152, 153.
Title a	and number	r, if any, of related cases. (See local rule 40.1(g)). If more than one prior related case has been filed in se indicate the title and number of the first filed case in this court.
Has a	prior actio	on between the same parties and based on the same claim ever been filed in this court?
Does 28 US	the complai (C §2403)	YES NO \overline{X} sint in this case question the constitutionality of an act of congress affecting the public interest? (See
lf so, i	is the U.S.A	YES NO X A. or an officer, agent or employee of the U.S. a party?
		YES NO X
ls this	i case requí	ired to be heard and determined by a district court of three judges pursuant to title 28 USC §22847 YES NO X
Do <u>all</u> Massa 40.1(d)	ichusetts ("	ies in this action, excluding governmental agencies of the united states and the Commonwealth of "governmental agencies"), residing in Massachusetts reside in the same division? - (See Local Rule
-		YES X NO
	A.	
	A.	If yes, in which division do all of the non-governmental parties reside? Eastern Division X Central Division Western Division
	A. B.	If yes, in which division do all of the non-governmental parties reside?
		If yes, in which division do all of the non-governmental parties reside? Eastern Division X Central Division Western Division If no, in which division do the majority of the plaintiffs or the only parties, excluding governmental
lf filing yes, sı	B. J a Notice o	If yes, in which division do all of the non-governmental parties reside? Eastern Division X Central Division Western Division If no, in which division do the majority of the plaintiffs or the only parties, excluding governmental agencies, residing in Massachusetts reside?
yes, sı	B. g a Notice of ubmit a sepa	If yes, in which division do all of the non-governmental parties reside? Eastern Division X Central Division Western Division If no, in which division do the majority of the plaintiffs or the only parties, excluding governmental agencies, residing in Massachusetts reside? Eastern Division Central Division Western Division of Removal - are there any motions pending in the state court requiring the attention of this Court? (If parate sheet identifying the motions)
yes, sı ASE TYPE	B. Ja Notice of ubmit a sep : OR PRINT)	If yes, in which division do all of the non-governmental parties reside? Eastern Division X Central Division Western Division If no, in which division do the majority of the plaintiffs or the only parties, excluding governmental agencies, residing in Massachusetts reside? Eastern Division Central Division Western Division of Removal - are there any motions pending in the state court requiring the attention of this Court? (If parate sheet identifying the motions)
yes, sı ASE TYPE RNEY'S N	B. J a Notice of ubmit a seprence of PRINT) OR PRINT)	If yes, in which division do all of the non-governmental parties reside? Eastern Division X Central Division Western Division If no, in which division do the majority of the plaintiffs or the only parties, excluding governmental agencies, residing in Massachusetts reside? Eastern Division Central Division Western Division of Removal - are there any motions pending in the state court requiring the attention of this Court? (If parate sheet identifying the motions)

(Coversheellocal.wpd - 10/17/02)